



DEVELOPING AN AUTOMATED TENDER EVALUATION SYSTEM FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS (ATES)

**A project paper submitted to College of Arts and Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree
Master of Science (Information Technology)
Universiti Utara Malaysia**

by

NOR AIZA ABDUL RAHMAN

**UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA
2010**

Copyright © Nor Aiza Abdul Rahman, 2010.



KOLEJ SASTERA DAN SAINS
(College of Arts and Sciences)
Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA KERTAS PROJECT
(Certification of Project Paper)

Saya yang bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(I, the undersigned, certify that)

NOR AIZA ABDUL RAHMAN
(86528)

calon untuk ijazah
(candidate for the degree of) **MSc.(Information Technology)**


telah mengemukakan kertas projek yang bertajuk
(has presented his/ her project paper of the following title)

DEVELOPING AN AUTOMATED TENDER EVALUATION SYSTEM
FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS (ATES)

seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit kertas projek
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of project paper)

bahawa kertas projek tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan
dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan.
*(that the project paper acceptable in form and content, and that a satisfactory
knowledge of the field is covered by the project paper).*

Nama Penyelia Utama
(Name of Main Supervisor) : **DR. FAUZIAH BAHAROM**

Tandatangan
(Signature) : 

Tarikh
(Date) : 18 / 5 / 2016

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from the Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or in their absence by the Dean of Academic Affairs. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in part, should be addressed to

Dean of Academic Affairs
College of Arts and Sciences
Universiti Utara Malaysia
06010 UUM Sintok
Kedah Darul Aman

ABSTRACT

Tender evaluation is an important part of a tendering process. The purpose of it is to help an organization in selecting the most suitable contractor to award the tender. There have been many issues on the criterion used in evaluating a tender. This criterion varies from one type of tender to another based on the type of the tender such as for work or IT projects. Currently, lowest price offered is one of the most important indicators taken under considerations by both type of tenders. However, there are also other indicators used in tender evaluation. The ability for the tender participants or the bidder to fulfill the technical requirements is also considered as an important indicator in evaluating a tender. There are other indicators as well such as work experience, qualifications of employees, past performance, financial capabilities and so on that is still need to be taken into consideration in evaluating a tender. This study is done to identify the criterion used in evaluating the tender of IT projects and a requirement model is then proposed based on the criterion found for an automated tender evaluation system. This requirement model is then reviewed by one of the experienced tender evaluation committee members to verify the completeness of functionality, the efficiency and the ease of use of the proposed model through a developed prototype.

ABSTRAK

Penilaian tender adalah satu bahagian yang penting dalam proses tender. Ia bertujuan untuk membantu sesebuah organisasi dalam memilih kontraktor yang paling sesuai untuk diberikan sesuatu tender. Terdapat pelbagai isu tentang kriteria yang digunakan dalam menilai tender. Kriteria-kriteria ini berbeza dari satu tender ke satu tender yang lain mengikut jenis tender tersebut sama ada tender untuk kerja atau tender untuk projek teknologi maklumat. Mengikut amalan semasa, penawaran harga terendah adalah salah satu indikator yang penting yang diambil kira bagi kedua-dua jenis tender. Walaubagaimanapun, terdapat juga indikator-indikator lain yang digunakan dalam penilaian tender. Kebolehan setiap petender untuk memenuhi keperluan teknikal juga diambil kira sebagai indikator penting dalam menilai sesebuah tender. Terdapat juga indikator-indikator lain seperti pengalaman kerja, kelulusan pekerja, prestasi kerja, keupayaan kewangan dan sebagainya yang perlu diambil kira dalam menilai sesebuah tender. Kajian ini dijalankan untuk mengenalpasti kriteria-kriteria yang diambil kira dalam menilai sesebuah tender bagi projek teknologi maklumat dan sebuah model keperluan dicadangkan dalam kajian ini berdasarkan kriteria-kriteria yang dikumpul bagi memenuhi keperluan sistem penilaian tender secara automatik. Model keperluan ini kemudiannya disemak oleh salah seorang ahli jawatankuasa penilaian tender yang berpengalaman bagi mengesahkan kelengkapan fungsian, keberkesanan dan kemudahan model yang dicadangkan melalui prototaip sistem yang dibina.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, the most merciful and benevolent, with his will and blessing that this study is finally completed.

Firstly, I would like to express my greatest gratitude to all that had contributed and supported me directly or indirectly throughout the journey of completing in this study.

Special thanks to Dr. Fauziah binti Baharom for her guidance and encouragement. I am in debt with all my friends that had been so helpful and understanding in giving their two cent ideas, thought and energy.

Finally to my family for endless support and sacrifices, all the appreciations in this world are not enough to convey my feeling of gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ABSTRAK.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Problem Statement.....	2
1.3 Research Questions.....	3
1.4 Research Objectives.....	3
1.5 Scope.....	4
1.6 Significance of Study.....	4
1.7 Report Structure.....	5

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction.....	7
2.2 Studies on Tender Evaluation.....	7
2.3 Tender Evaluation System.....	13
2.4 Price-based Tender Evaluation Practice.....	14
2.4.1 Tasmanian Department of Treasury and Finance.....	15
2.4.2 New South Wales (NSW) Department of Commerce.....	16
2.4.3 Malaysia Ministry of Finance (MOF).....	17
2.4 Summary.....	17

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction.....	19
3.2	Theoretical Study.....	20
3.3	Identify Key Indicators and Requirements.....	20
3.3.1	Case Study.....	21
3.3.1.1	Case Study Objectives.....	21
3.3.1.2	Questionnaire’s Design.....	21
3.3.1.3	Documentations Review.....	26
3.4	Construct Model.....	26
3.5	Develop Prototype.....	27
3.6	Evaluate Prototype.....	29

CHAPTER 4

CASE STUDY ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1	Introduction.....	31
4.2	Theoretical Study.....	31
4.3	Identify Key Indicators and Requirements.....	32
4.3.1	Case Study.....	33
4.3.1.1	Analysis of Questionnaires.....	33
4.3.1.2	Documentation Review.....	54
4.4	Discussion and Conclusion.....	58

CHAPTER 5

USE CASE MODEL AND ATES EVALUATION

5.1	Introduction.....	63
5.2	Proposed Model.....	63
5.2.1	Use Case Diagram.....	64
5.2.2	Use Case Specifications.....	66
5.2.3	Class Diagram.....	66
5.3	System Design.....	67
5.3.1	System Architecture	67
5.3.2	Database Scheme.....	68

5.4 ATES Evaluation..... 72

5.4.1 Evaluation Objective..... 72

5.4.2 Evaluation Criteria..... 72

5.4.3 Evaluation Methodology..... 72

5.4.4 Evaluation Result..... 73

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction..... 74

6.2 Contributions..... 75

6.3 Limitations..... 77

6.4 Future Work..... 78

REFERENCES..... 79

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX D

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Flow chart of the tendering process for open tender.....	10
Figure 2.2 Tender evaluation module in two modes.....	14
Figure 3.1 Research Methodology.....	19
Figure 3.2 RAD is a compressed Traditional Development Methodology.....	28
Figure 4.1 Percentage of the overall respondent's experienced in IT project's tender evaluation.....	34
Figure 4.2 Number of tenders on IT projects that has been evaluated by the respondents...	35
Figure 4.3 Percentage of the yes and no answers from the respondents on whether the indicators used in IT project tender evaluation vary from one evaluation to another.....	37
Figure 4.4 Number of respondents who said yes and no on whether their department has a standard guideline on IT project tender evaluation.....	39
Figure 4.5 Percentage on departments that use price estimation as indicators in evaluation.....	41
Figure 4.6 Time length for completing an IT tender project evaluation by each respondent's department.....	42
Figure 4.7 Percentage on how many respondents agreed that an automated system for tender evaluation can help in choosing the best company to award the tender.....	47
Figure 4.8 Percentage of respondents that thinks work experience is important in tender evaluation.....	52
Figure 4.9 Percentage on how many respondents agree that an automated system could help lessen the human mistakes in tender evaluation.....	53
Figure 4.10 Number of respondents who agreed that an automated system for tender price evaluation could help lessen human mistakes.....	53
Figure 4.11 Pre-evaluation example.....	55
Figure 5.1 Main Use Case Diagram.....	65
Figure 5.2 Class Diagram	67
Figure 5.3 Purposed System Architecture	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Principles evaluation categories of criteria.....	12
Table 2.2 Example on tender price evaluation result.....	15
Table 2.3 Example on NSW tender price evaluation.....	16
Table 4.1 Respondents answers to Q1.....	34
Table 4.2 Respondents answers to Q2.....	35
Table 4.3 Respondents answers to Q3.....	36
Table 4.4 Respondents answers to Q4.....	38
Table 4.5 Respondents answers to Q8.....	39
Table 4.6 Respondents answers to Q9.....	43
Table 4.7 Respondents answers to Q14.....	44
Table 4.8 Respondents answers to Q15.....	45
Table 4.9 Respondents answers to Q17.....	46
Table 4.10 Respondents answers to Q18.....	48
Table 4.11 Respondents answers to Q5.....	49
Table 4.12 Respondents answers to Q10.....	50
Table 4.13 Differences of supported documents.....	56
Table 4.14 Formula for calculating liquid capital.....	57
Table 5.1 jenis_tender Table Scheme.....	68
Table 5.2 keputusan_kriteria Table Scheme.....	69
Table 5.3 kriteria_pilihan Table Scheme.....	69
Table 5.4 level Table Scheme.....	69
Table 5.5 maklumat_tender Table Scheme.....	69
Table 5.6 pengguna Table Scheme.....	70
Table 5.7 senarai_semakan Table Scheme.....	71
Table 5.8 tawaran_petender Table Scheme.....	71
Table 6.1 Key indicators for tender evaluation.....	76

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ATES	Automated Tender Evaluation System
EU	European Union
IT	Information Technology
iWDSS	Intelligent Web-based Decision Support System
MCDM	Multi Criteria Decision Making
MOF	Ministry of Finance
NSW	New South Wales
RAD	Rapid Application Development
UML	Unified Modeling Language

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Tender evaluation is one of the most important parts of tendering process. The evaluation process plays a major role in helping the tender board members in selecting a suitable contractor to be awarded with the tender. Tender bidding by the participants will be evaluated based on certain criteria and only one suitable contractor will then be selected and awarded the project (Cha, Chiu & Hung, 2007).

As tender evaluation took place at the early stage of the project life cycle, the effectiveness of the process of selecting the winning bidder is certainly important and directly related to the project success and the achievement of specified measurement objectives (Lopes & Flavell, 1998). The procedure is considered crucial and critical where the performance of the project will be affected if the evaluation is carried out without proper and accurate method (Faridah, 2007) thus affecting the organization and contractor reputation in future (Mohamad Noor et al. 2003, 2008). Therefore, the evaluation of the bidders and their ability must be coherent

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, I. & Minkarah, I. (1988). An expert system for selecting bid markups, *Proceedings of 5th Conference on Computing in Civil Engineering*, 229-238.
- Alsugair, A. M. (1999). Framework for evaluating bids of construction contractors. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 15(2), 72-78.
- Argawal, R., Prasad, J., Tanniru, M. & Lynch, J. (2000). Risks of Rapid Application Development. *Communications of the ACM*, 43(11).
- Banaitienė, N. & Banaitis, A. (2006). Analysis of Criteria for Contractors' Qualification Evaluation. *Ūkio Technologinis Ir Ekonominis Vystymas*, 12(4), 276-282 (Retrieved from http://www.tede.vgtu.lt/upload/ukis_zurn/03_2006_nr4.pdf)
- Berenbach, B. & Wolf, T. (2007). A unified requirements model; integrating features, use cases, requirements, requirements analysis and hazard analysis. *International Conference on Global Software Engineering(ICGSE 2007)*. IEEE.
- Boer, L. D., Dijkhuizen, G. V. & Telgen, J. (2000). A basis of modelling the costs of supplier selection: the economics tender quantity. *Journal of Operational Research Society*, 51, 1128-1135.
- Cagno, E., Caron, F., Perego, A. (2001). Multi-criteria assessment of the probability of winning in the competitive bidding process. *International Journal of Project Management*, 19, 313-324.

Cernosek, G & Naiburg, E. (2004). The Value of Modeling. IBM.

Chan, L. S., Chiu, D. K. W. & Hung, P. C. K. (2007). e-Tendering with Web Services: A Case Study on the Tendering Process of Building Construction. *IEEE International Conference on Services Computing (SCC 2007)*.

Chua, D. K. H. & Li, D. Z. (2001). Case-based reasoning approach in bid decision making. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 127(1), 35-45.

Connolly, J. P. (2002). Discussion of “bid-spread” by Martin Skitmore, Derek Drew and Stephen Ngai, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 128(5), 461-462.

Domberger, S., Hall, C. & Li, E. A. L. (1995). The Determinants Of Price And Quality In Competitively Tendered Contracts*. *The Economic Journal*, 105 (November), 1454-1470.

Eldukair, Z.A. (1990). Fuzzy decisions in bidding strategies. *Uncertainty Modeling and Analysis Proceeding*. IEEE, 591-594.

Faridah, M. H. (2007). Contractor’s Perception of the Use of Statistical Approach in the Tender Evaluation at the Public Works Department, Malaysia. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 4(12), 1084-1089.

Fayek, A. (1997). A competitive tendering strategy model and software system based on fuzzy set theory. *IEEE*, 236-240.

- Fayek, A., Duffield, C. F. & Young, D. M. (1995). The design and implementation of an integrated computer-aided estimating and tendering system that utilises fuzzy logic, *Building for the 21st Century, Proceedings of Fifth East Asia-Pacific Conference on Structural Engineering and Construction*, 1, 859-864.
- Fong, S. & Yan, Z. (2009). Design of a Web-based Tendering System for e-Government Procurement. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance 2009*.
- Gudmudsson, K. & Techn, D. (2005). PQE: A Method for Tender Evaluation. *The 2005 World Sustainable Building Conference (SB05 Tokyo)*.
- Hatash, Z. & Skitmore, M. (1998). Contractor selection using multicriteria utility theory: An additive model. *Building and Environment*, 33, 105–115.
- Hegazy, T. & Moselhi, O. (1995). Elements of cost estimation: a survey in Canada and the United States, *Cost Engineering*, 37(5), 27-33.
- Juang, C. H., Burati, J. L. & Kalidindi, S. N. (1987). A fuzzy system for bid proposal evaluation using microcomputers, *Civil Engineering Systems*, 4(3), 124-130.
- King, M. & Phythian, G. H. (1992). Validating an Expert Support System for Tender Enquiry Evaluation: A Case Study. *The Journal of Operational Research Society*, 43 (3), 203-214.
- Kong, W. K. & Cheung, S. M. (1996). A Multi-Attribute Tender Evaluation Model. *CIB W89 Beijing International Conference*.

- Kothari C.R. (1985). *Research methodology: methods and techniques* (2nd ed.) New Delhi: Vishwaprakashan.
- Lai, K. K. (2004). A method used for evaluating bids in the Chinese construction industry. *International Journal of Project Management*, 22, 193-201.
- Lauesen, S. (1998). Usability Requirements in a Tender Process. *Proceedings of OZCHI'98*, IEEE. (Retrieved from <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.eserv.uum.edu.my/iel4/5915/15768/00732203.pdf?tp=&arnumber=732203&isnumber=15768>)
- Lindquist, T. M. & Li, F. (2002). An Effective Genetic Algorithm Applied to the Optimal Selection of Standing Reserve Tenders. *Power Engineering Society Summer Meeting, IEEE*, 3, 1633-1638.
- Lopes, M. & Flavell, R. (1998). Project appraisal – a framework to assess non-financial aspects of projects during the project life cycle. *International Journal of Project Management*, 16(4), 223-233.
- Lorentziadis, P. L. (2008). Post-objective determination of weights of the evaluation factors in public procurement tenders. *European journal of Operational Research*, 200(2010), 261-267.
- Lou, E. C. W (2007). Ready? Go to the National E-Tendering Initiative – A Malaysian Experience. *CIB World Building Congress 2007*.

- Lubbe, S. (2003). The development of a case study methodology in the information technology (IT) field: a step by step approach. New York: ACM. (Retrieved from http://www.acm.org.eserv.uum.edu.my/ubiquity/views/v4i27_lubbe.pdf?CFID=87140029&CFTOKEN=36375904)
- Martin, J (1991). *Rapid Application Development*. New York: Macmillan
- McKim, R. A. (1997). Bidding strategies for conventional and trenchless technologies considering social costs. *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering*, 24(5), 819-827.
- Mohamad Noor, N. M., Abdul Samat, N. H., Yazid M. Saman , M., Suzuri Hitam, M., & Man, M. (2007). iWDSS-Tender: Intelligent Web-based Decision Support System for Tender Evaluation. *2007 IEEE International Symposium on Signal Processing and Information Technology*, 1011-1016.
- Mohamamad Noor, N. M., Mohamad, R., Man, M. & Abdullah, A. I. (2008). Decision Support for Web-based Prequalification Tender Management System in Construction Projects. *IEEE*.
- Mohamamad Noor, N. M., Papamichail, K. N., & Warboys, B. (2003). Process Modelling for Online Communications in Tendering Process. *IEEE Computer Society Proceedings of the 29th EUROMICRO Conference (EUROMICRO'03)*.
- Moselhi, O., Hegazy, T. & Fazio, P. (1993). DBID: analogy-based DSS for bidding in construction. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 119(3), 466-479.
- Nguyen, V. U. (1985). Tender evaluation by fuzzy sets. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 111(3), 231-243.

- Ohno, T. & Harada, Y. (2004). A Comparison of Tendering and Contracting Systems for Public Works between Japan, the United States and EU Countries. *Government Auditing Review – Board of Audit Japan*, 13, 49-71.
- Pongpeng, J. & Liston, J. (2003). TenSeM: a multicriteria and multidecision-makers' model in tender evaluation. *Construction Management and Economics*, 21(1), 21-30.
- Rapcsak, T., Sagi, Z., Toth, T. & Ketszeri, L. (2000). Evaluation of tenders in information Technology. *Decision Support System*, 30, 1-10.
- Russell, J. S. (1992), Decision models for analysis and evaluation of construction contractors. *Construction Management and Economics*, 10, 185-202.
- Stark, R. M. & Rothkopf, M. H. (1979). Competitive bidding: a comprehensive bibliography, *Operations Research*, 27(2), 364-390.
- Seydel, J. & Olson, D. L. (1990). Bids considering multiple criteria. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 116(4), 609-623
- Shash, A. A. (1998). Subcontractor's bidding decisions. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 124(2), 101-106.
- Singh, D. & Tiong, R. L. K. (2005). A fuzzy decision framework for contractor selection. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 131, 62-70.

Skitmore, M., Drew, D. & Ngai, S. (2001). Bid-spread. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 127(2), 149-153.

SPS (2007). *Tendering Process* (Retrieved from http://www.managingprocurement.commerce.nsw.gov.au/service_provider_selection_consultancy_services/cs_gl_tender_process.doc) (access date: 21/01/2009)

Sun, Y. & Feng Y. (2006). Study on the Power Weight Distribution of the Tender Member in the Joint Procurement Tender. International Conference on Management Science and Engineering. (Retrieved from <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org.eserv.uum.edu.my/iel5/4094461/4037319/04104939.pdf?tp=&arnumber=4104939&isnumber=4037319>)

Guidelines on Tender Evaluation using Weighted Criteria for Building Works and Services (1999), Tasmanian Department of Treasury and Finance. (Retrieved from [http://147.109.254.181/domino/bfg.nsf/E3AD19378F60B981CA256C95000EC9D5/\\$FILE/Guidelines+on+Tender+Evaluation+-+weighted+criteria+V2.pdf](http://147.109.254.181/domino/bfg.nsf/E3AD19378F60B981CA256C95000EC9D5/$FILE/Guidelines+on+Tender+Evaluation+-+weighted+criteria+V2.pdf))

Tender Evaluation Guideline (2008), Malaysia Ministry of Finance. (Retrieved from <http://www.treasury.gov.my/pekeliling/sap/sap2008-03-21.pdf>)

Tendering Manual (2004). NSW Department of Commerce.

Wong, C. H., Holt, G. D. & Cooper, P. A. (2000). Lowest price or value? Investigation of UK construction clients' tender selection process. *Construction Management and Economics*, 18(7), 767-774.

Wyatt, D. J., Kayis, B. & Willey, K. (2008). Identifying key factors in the evaluation of tenders for projects and services. *International Journal of Project Management*, 27, 250-260.